

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are presented for further examination. Claims 6-8 were previously cancelled.

In the final Office Action mailed April 9, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over previously-cited U.S. Patent No. 6,405,251 (“Bullard”) in view of previously-cited U.S. Patent No. 6,418,467 (“Schweitzer”) and further in view of previously-cited U.S. Patent No. 7,155,608 (“Malik”). Claims 4-6 were rejected as obvious over Bullard, Schweitzer, Malik, and further in view of Official Notice.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the bases for the rejections and requests reconsideration and further examination of the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3 as obvious over Bullard et al. in view of Schweitzer et al. and further in view of Malik.

According to the technical solution of the method of claim 1, the aggregated network usage information is sent from the NetStream Collector to the association analysis server, and the user’s network resource information is uploaded from the AAA server to the association analysis server. Thereby, the association analysis server performs real-time association analysis using (1) the aggregated network usage information, i.e., a source IP address, a destination IP address, a source port number, a destination port number, a number of bytes, and a timestamp and (2) the user’s network resource information, i.e., a user's account number, a start time and a stop time of network access, an IP address, a network access location, and a service attribute, and the network usage information.

Therefore, the method of claim 1 associates isolated network usage information with a user’s network resource information uploaded from the AAA server organically, so that user accesses to websites (IP addresses), services (port numbers), duration and traffic, and service attribute in a certain time period are recorded accurately.

However, as the Examiner acknowledges in the Remarks accompanying the rejection, Bullard does not teach an AAA server recording the user’s network resource

information and uploading this information from the AAA server to the association analysis server.

With respect to Schweitzer, this reference describes in Column 11, lines 25-67: “...various field enhancements. A field enhancement includes applying zero or more functions to a field before storing the field in a specified field in the central database. ... Through an enhancement procedure the information collected from the proxy server 101 can be supplemented by the information from the DNS 102. Therefore, the name of the host is added to the data (the data record) collected from the proxy server 101. The process of adding new data to the data record from different network devices can be repeated several times until all required data is collected and the data record is placed in the central database....”

However, Schweitzer fails to disclose or suggest that the user’s network resource information is uploaded from an AAA server to an association analysis server, and it fails to teach or suggest performing real-time association analysis with the aggregated network usage information.

That is, Schweitzer does not cure the noted deficiencies of Bullard. Hence, the combination of Bullard and Schweitzer fails to teach or suggest the method of claim 1.

Turning next to Malik, the Examiner attempted to align Malik’s “identification of the station” with “a network access location” disclosed in the present application. However, “the network access location” disclosed in the present application represents the location where a user accesses the network, which can be a user network prefix or DSLAM PVC number, etc. In the present claimed method, “the network access location” belongs to the user’s network resource information, which is different from “the identification of the station” taught by Malik.

Thus, those skilled in the art would find no teaching or suggestion for the method of claim 1 without any creative work over Bullard in view of Schweitzer and Malik. That is, claim 1 cannot be rendered obvious by Bullard in view of Schweitzer and Malik.

Claims 2-5 are allowable for the features recited therein as well as for the reasons why claim 1 is allowable. Based on at least the above reasons, applicant believes that all of the claims remaining in this application are allowable over Bullard in view of Schweitzer and Malik.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims remaining in this application are in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner finds minor informalities that can be resolved by telephone conference, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone at (206) 622-4900 in order to expeditiously resolve prosecution of this application. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing this case to issuance is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

Respectfully submitted,

SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/E. Russell Tarleton/

E. Russell Tarleton

Registration No. 31,800

ERT:jk

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400
Seattle, Washington 98104
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031